

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 11-16 and 20 remain in this application, of which Claims 1-7 and 20 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 11, 15 and 16, the independent claims under consideration, and Claims 12 and 20, have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention, in terms which distinguish over the art of record. These amendments, however, are intended merely to clarify the claim language, so as to distinguish more clearly over the prior art, and do not represent a change in what Applicants are claiming. Thus, this Amendment is to be viewed as a traversal of the prior-art rejection. Claims 8-10 and 17-19, withdrawn from consideration, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter.

Initially, it is noted that the Examiner agrees that Claim 20 is a claim linking the claims of the elected invention of Group III (Claims 11-16 and 20), and those of the non-elected invention of Group I (Claims 1-7 and 20). From the discussion in item 1 of the Detailed Action, it is understood that upon allowance of Claim 11 (for example), Claim 20 will also be allowable (since it is being amended to conform to Claim 11), and that at that time, the withdrawn claims directed to Group I (Claims 1-7) would be rejoined and allowed. In the meantime, in view of MPEP § 814, Applicants believe that Claim 20 should also have been examined, together with the other claims directed to the invention of Group III.

Claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,828,466 (Imai et al.).

The aspects of the invention recited in the independent claims under consideration have been adequately discussed in Applicants' previous papers, as has *Imai*, and it

is not believed to necessary to repeat that discussion in full. Applicants have amended Claims 11, 15 and 16 to emphasize still more clearly that the added data that is not printed by the printer unit is processed instead by another unit. More particularly, Claims 11, 15 and 16 now recite that the peripheral apparatus has both a printer unit and a unit other than the printer unit, and that the information added to the printing data is information processed by the unit other than the printer unit. By virtue of this feature, it becomes possible to cause the printing data to be printed by the printer unit after processing of the printing data by the other unit.

In the *Imai* arrangement, a facsimile apparatus has a printer unit 2 and a facsimile unit 1 as a peripheral apparatus. Even taking the facsimile unit 1 as corresponding to the recited unit other than the printer unit, however, Applicants respectfully submit that *Imai* fails to teach adding information to be processed by the facsimile unit 1 to the printing data transferred to and printed by the printer unit 2. In this regard, Applicants note the description about Fig.2 of *Imai*, stating that the switch of interface control unit 108 is connected with B and the printing data is not transferred to the facsimile MPU 101 when transferring the printing data from the information processing terminal to the printer unit 2 (see col. 8, line 57, through col. 9, line 3).

For at least this reason, Claims 11, 15 and 16 are believed to be clearly allowable over *Imai*, and accordingly allowance of those claims, as well as of Claim 20, and rejoinder and allowance of Claims 1-7, are respectfully requested.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims under consideration, and those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims under consideration are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In any event, however, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No.: 28,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 373188v1